



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/665,642	09/19/2003	Steve LanPing Huang	81230.94US1	6107
34018 7590 08/16/2007 GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP 77 WEST WACKER DRIVE SUITE 2500 CHICAGO, IL 60601-1732			EXAMINER HOLLOWAY III, EDWIN C	
			ART UNIT 2612	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/16/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

### Application No.

10/665,642

### Applicant(s)

HUANG ET AL.

### Examiner

Edwin C. Holloway, III

### Art Unit

2612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 June 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 68-109 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 68-109 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) ✓
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 2612

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6-4-07 has been entered. The examiner has considered the new presentation of claims and applicant's arguments in view of the disclosure and the present state of the prior art. And it is the examiner's opinion that the claims are unpatentable for the reasons set forth in this Office action:

#### ***Specification***

2. The amendment to the specification to update the continuing data is acknowledged. Applicant is reminded that specification should again be updated to include the current status and patent numbers for any listed applications that are issued or abandoned.

#### ***Priority***

3. Applicant's claim for the benefit of a prior-filed application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) or under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c) is acknowledged. Applicant has not complied with one

Art Unit: 2612

or more conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. 120 as follows:

The later-filed application must be an application for a patent for an invention that is also disclosed in the prior application (the parent or original nonprovisional application or provisional application). The disclosure of the invention in the parent application and in the later-filed application must be sufficient to comply with the requirements of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112. See *Transco Products, Inc. v. Performance Contracting, Inc.*, 38 F.3d 551, 32 USPQ2d 1077 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

The disclosure of the following prior-filed applications fails to provide adequate support or enablement in the manner provided by the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 for one or more claims of this application:

- Application No. 10/151,635, filed 20 May 2002, which is (1) a CIP of 09/615,473, filed 13 July 2002; (2) CIP of 09/334,584, filed 16 July 1999 (now US 6,781,518), which is a CIP of 09/121,229, filed 23 July 1998 (now US 6,157,319); and (3) a CIP of 09/905,423, filed 13 July 2001, which claims benefit of 60/264,767, filed on 29 January 2001.
- Application No. 10/288,727, which claims benefit of 60/344,020, filed 20 December 2001, and 60/334,774, filed 20 November 2001.

These applications (10/151,635, 09/615,473, 09/334,584, 09/121,229, 09/905,423, and 10/288,727 all fail to provide

Art Unit: 2612

adequate support a radio frequency identification (RFID) tag and reading system as claimed in claims 68-81, 84-92 and 95-109 discussed on pages 11-18, 26-31, and 36 of the current specification as filed. Further, although the 10151635 application included manufacturer information, the other claimed applications fail to provide adequate support for the machine readable tag storing standardized information that functions to identify at least the appliance and manufacturer of the appliance in claims 82-109. Consequently, in the prosecution of this application, the priority date of the subject matter in claims 82-83 and 93-94 is established to be the filing date of the 10151635 application (20 May 2002), and for the subject matter of all other claims is established to be the filing date of the instant application (i.e., 19 September 2003).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35

U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 91-92 and 101-107 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter

Art Unit: 2612

which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The instant application fails to provide adequate support for the limitation in claims 91-92 and 101-107 of without again requiring use of the device of the universal remote control is not supported by the original specification as this appears to be contradicted by "using multiple steps" (pg 16 line 11), "second time" (pg. 16 line 19) and/or "additionally use" (pg 16 line 20).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

7. Claims 68-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stefanik (US006750801B2) in combination with Kaario (US 2005/0242167) and Nickum (US006359661B1).

Regarding claim 68, Stefanik discloses a method of configuring an appliance including receiving data directly from a smartcard via the receiver of a universal remote control the data user profile, parental controls, visual settings or any other information individualized to the user or unique to the individual in col. 6 lines 54-62. The information is forwarded from the remote control by transmitter 86 to receiver 144 of

Art Unit: 2612

appliance or consumer electronic device 140 in fig. 4 and col. 7 lines 10-24. The appliance is programmed to be configured in response to this information in col. 5 lines 24-41. Stefanik differs from the claims by not specifying the smartcard is an RFID tag and not specifying preferences mapped within memory of the appliance in accordance with the individual represented by the RFID.

Kaario discloses an analogous art method of configuring an appliance using an RFID token or tag. See the abstract. Par. 0043 and 0066 state that ID data may be stored on an RFID tag/transponder, or smart card, or other media. The appliance includes memory 235 that maps preferences to the appliance based on the individual identified by the RFID/smartcard. See par. 0036 and 0041.

Nickum discloses an analogous art system and method for creating, maintaining and activating a user customizable profile by inputting an ID via a remote controller. The profile may be stored in the remote or stored in the appliance, such as a TV, and selected by the ID. The ID may be stored in the remote or input by the user, and may provide access restriction such as channel blocking. See the abstract col. 4 line 32 col. 5 line 65 and col. 8 lines 34-46.

Regarding claim 68, it would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit: 2612

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the method of Stefanik to have included the identifying information on a RFID as disclosed in Kaario because Kaario discloses RFID and smart card as obvious alternatives for appliance configuration and Stefanik suggest contactless reading in col. 6 lines 50-53. Alternatively, it would have been obvious to have included the in Kaario the reader on the universal remote 210 to forward the information to the appliance as disclosed by Stefanik in view of Kaario teaching the storing the RFID data on other devices. Further, storing within memory of the appliance one or more preferences mapped to an individual represented by the RFID would have been obvious in view of the memory in the appliance of Kaario for storing electronic program guide (EPG) information and Nickum disclosing user profile related to channel selection and other TV programming selected by user ID and stored on the appliance as an alternative to storage on the remote control and suggested by Stefanik also being directed to configuration of EPG events and other settings. Although Kaario discloses URL or IP address identifying the location of data on a network, it would have been obvious to have stored the data on the appliance in view of par. 39 line 5 of Kaario disclosing that data can be stored locally or remotely and par. 0063-0064 of Kaario disclosing



Art Unit: 2612

uploading or moving of profiles from the appliance to a server or another appliance, thus storing one or more profile on an appliance.

Regarding claim 69, limited access would have been obvious in view of the parental controls, pay-per-view purchase and spending limits in col. 6 lines 54-63 of Stefanik.

Regarding claim 70, accessing content would have been obvious in view of the user history, favorite shows, favorite channels,... in col. 6 lines 54-63 of Stefanik.

Regarding claim 71, command transmission would have been obvious in view of forwarding the read data by remote control signal in col. 7 lines 17-24 and/or the parental control and visual settings in col. 6 lines 54-63 of Stefanik.

8. Claims 82-86, 93-97 and 108-109 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang (US 6,133,847) in view of Kitao (US006124804A) and [Sarma (The Networked Physical World) or Brock (The Electronic Product Code)].

Referring to claims 82 and 93, Yang teaches a configurable remote control device 100 having a memory 120 that stores programming code for controlling a plurality of appliances 160, such as VCR 200 and TV 220 (see Figs. 1-3B; Col. 3, lines 50-56; Col. 4, lines 39-46; and Col. 8, lines 32-44). As shown in

Art Unit: 2612

Figs. 1-3B, Yang's remote control device 100 communicates bi-directionally with appliance 160 via data link 150, which is a radio frequency (RF) signal (see Col. 3, lines 19-24 and 66-67; Col. 4, lines 1-5; and Col. 8, lines 10-24). As shown in Fig. 4, Yang's method for setting up remote control device 100, which includes processor 135 and instructions for setting up remote control device 100 upon receiving an appliance 160's interface control signal (see Col. 4, lines 6-14), comprises (a) receiving an interface control signal, which is an identification signal, from a plurality of appliances 160 via remote control device 100's receiver 112 at step 410 (see Fig. 1; Col. 3, lines 25-29 and 50-65; Col. 7, lines 22-26; and Col. 8, lines 10-17 and 54-59); and (b) using the interface control signal received from each appliance 160 to cause select commands to be mapped to select command keys at steps 415 and 420, whereby remote control device 100 is set up such that activation of one or more of the select command keys causes remote control device 100 to issue via its transmitter 114 one or more of the select commands to command operation of an appliance 160 that has been associated with the interface control signal at step 425 (see Figs. 2A, 2B, 3A, and 3B; Col. 4, lines 6-31 and 52-67; Col. 5, lines 1-32 and 48-67; Col. 6, lines 1-58; and Col. 7, lines 26-34). Yang discloses a separate transmitter 114 and receiver 112 that may

Art Unit: 2612

be of different medium (IR vs. RF) but uses the transmitter for remote control signals (col. 3 lines 7-46). Yang, however, fails to teach that the interface control signal is received from a machine readable tag storing standardized information that functions to identify at least the appliance and vendor of the appliance.

In analogous art, Kitao discloses a method and configuring a remote controller. The remote controller sends a trigger signal and the appliance that replies with a identifying device code stored in memory 117. The device code includes information identifying the manufacturer name and the appliance (such as category, version, lot number). This information is used to configure the controller. See col. 3 lines 15-33 and col. 4 lines 33-67. The controller may include a trigger transmitter 301 separate from the remote control command transmitter 302 and receiver 105 in fig. 3 and col. 8 lines 60-65.

Sarma discloses a method for tagging of products or objects with ID using an open architecture that is flexible and adaptable to change. An electronic product code or EPC standard code with code including manufacturer and product data is included on pg. 6, fig. 1 that is stored in a RF or EMID tag in sec. 4.2 on pp. 6+. Scanned optical UPC tags are discussed on pg. 6 lines 5-6 as known standard ID tags. Use in the home is

Art Unit: 2612

provided by discussion of UPnP for home in sec. 8.2 on pg. 14 and HAVi protocol for home use in sec. 8.4 on pp. 14+.

Brock discloses a method for tagging of products or objects with ID using an open standard that is simple, extensible and efficient. An electronic product code or EPC standard code with code having manufacturer and product data is included in fig. 9 and sec. 5.4.1 on pp. 19+ that is stored in a barcode, RFID or EMID tag in sec. 2.1 on pg. 6. Scanned optical UPC tags are further discussed in sec. 3.1 on pp. 7+ and sec. 4.12 on pp. 17+ as known in barcode tags that include manufacturer and product information. Use in the home is provided by discussion operating not just at checkout, but in the home in sec. 2 (line 10) on p. 5.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Yang's remote control device 100 and method as taught by Sarma or Brock such that a remote control device 100 receives appliance 160's interface control data from a machine readable tag storing standardized information that functions to identify at least the appliance and manufacturer of the appliance because the tag of Sarma or Brock enables flexible, simple, extensible and efficient retrieval of pertinent information to uniquely identify a plurality of items for use in the home and is

Art Unit: 2612

suggested by Kitao using a device code with manufacturer and appliance data in a memory tagging an appliance for configuring a remote controller. Further, regarding separate transmission circuit, Yang discloses command transmitter 114 and data receiver 114, but if a trigger/interrogation transmitter separate from the command transmitter is required, then such would have been obvious in view of Kitao because Kitao discloses such two transmitters as an alternative configuration in a method for configuring a remote controller. Further, it has been held that to be entitled to weight in method claims, the recited structure limitations therein must affect the method in a manipulative sense, and not to amount to the mere claiming of a use of a particular structure. *Ex parte Pfeiffer*, 1962 C.D. 408 (1961).

Regarding claims 83 and 94, optical UPC labels are disclosed in Sarma or Brock and would have been obvious in view of the optical communication in Yang and/or for compatibility with prior art systems.

Regarding claims 84 and 95, RFID/EMID RF tags are disclosed in Sarma or Brock and would have been obvious for know advantages such as non-line of sight communication and suggested by col. 3 line 40-42 of Yang teaching different control and identification signal mediums such as IR and RF.

Art Unit: 2612

Regarding claims 85 and 96, the combination applied above comprises using the data received from an RFID tag to cause select programming code (i.e., select commands) stored in remote control device 100's memory 120 (i.e., a library stored locally on remote control device 100) to be mapped to select command keys (see Yang, Col. 3, lines 50-65; Col. 4, lines 6-31 and 52-67; Col. 5, lines 1-32 and 48-67; and Col. 6, lines 1-58).

Regarding claims 86 and 97, Yang teaches that remote control device 100 will automatically attempt to find the programming code in one of the many download mechanisms, starting with appliance 160 itself, and request that the programming code for a particular appliance identifier be downloaded to remote control device 100 when remote control device 100 receives an interface control signal from an appliance 160 that lacks programming code already stored in remote control device 100's memory 120 (see Yang, Col. 8, lines 54-66); thus Yang, as modified by Sarma or Brock, teaches using the data received from an machine readable tag to cause programming code (i.e., select commands) from a library stored within appliance 160 to be downloaded into remote control device 100 and mapped to select command keys (see Yang, Figs. 2A, 2B, 3A, and 3B; Col. 4, lines 6-31 and 52-67; Col. 5, lines 1-32 and 48-67; Col. 6, lines 1-58; and Col. 7, lines 26-34).

Art Unit: 2612

Regarding claim 108, the combination applied above further comprises remote control 100 device transmitting an RF signal to initiate receiving data via RF signal from the RFID tags (see the trigger signal in Kitao the corresponds to an interrogation signal from an RFID reader.

Regarding claim 25, the combination applied above comprises receiving data from each RFID tag within a radio communication area of remote control device 100 (see Yang, Col. 3, lines 19-29 and Col. 8, lines 10-14; col. 12 line 66 - col. 13 line 37 of Kita; p. 12 of Sarma; and p. 6 of Brock.

9. Claims 87-88, 90, 98-99 and 101 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang (US 6,133,847) in view of Kitao (US006124804A) and [Sarma or Brock] as applied above, and further in view of Harris et al. (US 2001/0033243).

Regarding claims 87-88, 90, 98-99 and 101, though Yang teaches remote control device 100 automatically attempting to find the programming code in one of the many download mechanisms and request that the programming code for a particular appliance identifier be downloaded to remote control device 100 when remote control device 100 receives an interface control signal from an appliance 160 that lacks programming code already stored in remote control device 100's memory 120 (see Yang, Col. 8,

Art Unit: 2612

lines 54-66), the combination applied above lacks (1) establishing a connection with the library directly from remote control device 100 (as called for in claims 87 and 97), and (2) establishing a connection with the library by means of an intermediate device (as called for in claims 88 and 99), wherein (3) the intermediate device is a personal computer (as called for in claims 90 and 101).

In an analogous art, Harris teaches an online remote control configuration system, as shown in Figs. 7 and 8, comprising electronic system 100 of remote control configuration system 10 (hereinafter referred to as "remote control 10") that connects to Internet 130 via computer system 60 (i.e., a personal computer) or directly (see Sections [0050]-[0059]). Harris's method for setting up remote control 10, which has a microprocessor 116 that retrieves instruction from memory in order to control remote control 10 (see Sections [0054]-[0055], [0058], and [0061]), comprises (a) receiving a signal emitted from a remote control corresponding to electronic device 12 and uploading the sampled signal to control station 40 via Internet 130 or entering relevant product information of electronic device 12, such as device type and model, to control station 40 via Internet 130 (see Sections [0047]-[0048] and [0077]-[0084]); and (b) using the sampled signal to cause configuration data



Art Unit: 2612

(i.e., select commands) from a library stored at control station 40 to be downloaded into remote control 10 and mapped to select command keys (see Sections [0063], [0082], and [0085]-[0086]).

As called for in claims 87 and 98, Harris's method includes remote control 10 establishing an Internet connection with a library stored at control station 40 directly from remote control 10 (see Fig. 8 and Sections [0059], [0081], and [0085]).

As called for in claims 88 and 99, Harris's method also includes remote control 10 establishing an Internet connection with a library stored at control station 40 by means of an intermediate device, wherein the intermediate device is computer system 60 (i.e., a personal computer since remote control 10 is used for controlling home electronic devices), as called for in claims 89 and 101 (see Fig. 7 and Sections [0059], [0081], and [0085]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the remote control device 100 and method of the combination applied above as taught by Harris because establishing a connection with the library directly from remote control device 100 (as called for in claims 87 and 98) or establishing a connection with the library by means of an intermediate device (as called for in claims 88 and 99), wherein

Art Unit: 2612

the intermediate device is a personal computer (as called for in claims 90 and 101), allows equipment manufacturers to maintain a centralized library containing the programming codes for each appliance 160, thereby eliminating the need to provide programming codes within each appliance 160, which reduces production costs, and facilitating programming code updates.

10. Claims 88-89 and 99-100 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang (US 6,133,847) in view of Kitao (US006124804A) and [Sarma or Brock] as applied above, and further in view of van Ee et al. (US 6,774,813).

Regarding claims 88-89 and 99-100, though Yang teaches remote control device 100 automatically attempting to find the programming code in one of the many download mechanisms and request that the programming code for a particular appliance identifier be downloaded to remote control device 100 when remote control device 100 receives an interface control signal from an appliance 160 that lacks programming code already stored in remote control device 100's memory 120 (see Yang, Col. 8, lines 54-66), the method of the combination applied above lacks establishing a connection with the library by means of an intermediate device (as called for in claims 88 and 99), wherein the intermediate device is a cable set top box (as called for in

Art Unit: 2612

claims 89 and 100).

In an analogous art, van Ee's system, as shown in Fig. 1, comprises (1) programmable control device 106 that controls apparatus 102 and 104 (see Col. 5, lines 30-49) and (2) programming means 110, which is a set top box, that programs control device 106 and includes Internet connection hardware 114 that connects to remote server 118, which has a database (i.e., library) of a plurality of respective sets of multiple control signals to control a plurality of apparatuses (see Col. 5, lines 50-65). Van Ee's method, as shown in Fig. 2, comprises (a) a user selecting control codes from a database (i.e., library) stored at remote server 118 to be downloaded into control device 106 and mapped to select command keys at step 202 (see Col. 5, lines 50-67; Col. 6, lines 1-23; and Col. 7, lines 35-42); (b) remote server 118 identifying all the sets of control codes corresponding to the user-selected apparatus type/brand combination at step 206 and selecting a particular control code corresponding to a particular function of the apparatus to be controlled and transmitted the control codes to programming means 110 via Internet 116 at step 210 (see Col. 7, lines 43-49); (c) programming means 110 interleaving control codes with associated identifier codes and transmitting the interleaved control signal to control device 106 to program control device

Art Unit: 2612

106 at step 214 (see Col. 7, lines 50-54); (d) the user pressing a button on control device 106's user interface 108 to transmit a control code and its associated identified code for each press at step 216 to determine whether the apparatus to be controlled responded to the transmitted control code at step 218 (see Col. 7, lines 54-58); (e) if the apparatus responded to a transmitted control code, associating the identifier code associated with the control code that caused the apparatus to respond with its respective control code at step 220, and transmitting the respective control code to remote server 118 via Internet 116 at step 22 (see Col. 7, lines 60-66); (f) remote server 118 identifying the set of control codes in which the respective control code belongs to at step 22 and transmitting the identified set to programming means 110 at step 226 (see Col. 7, lines 66-67 and Col. 8, lines 1-2); and (g) programming means 110 transmitting the identified set to control device 106 to associate the control codes of the identified set with control device 106's multiple user inputs (i.e., to map select commands to select command keys). As called for in claims 88 and 99, van Ee's method comprises control device 106 establishing a connection with remote server 118's library by means of an intermediate device, which is a set top box, as called for in claims 89 and 100 (see Col. 5, lines 50-56; Col. 7, lines 36-67;

Art Unit: 2612

and Col. 8, lines 1-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify remote control device 100 and method of the combination applied above as taught by van Ee because establishing a connection with the library by means of an intermediate device (as called for in claims 88 and 99), wherein the intermediate device is a cable set top box (as called for in claims 89 and 100), allows equipment manufacturers to maintain a centralized library containing the programming codes for each appliance 160, thereby eliminating the need to provide programming codes within each appliance 160, which reduces production costs, and facilitating programming code updates.

11. Claims 91-92, and 102-107 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang (US 6,133,847) in view of Kitao (US006124804A) and [Sarma or Brock] as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Gharapetian (US 2002/0101357).

Regarding claims 91-92, and 102-107, the combination applied above comprises using the data received from each of the RFID tags to automatically map select commands to select command keys, as explained in the previous rejections of claim 82, but lacks remote control device 100 simultaneously commanding a

Art Unit: 2612

plurality of appliances 160 when remote control device 100 is placed in such a mode.

In an analogous art, Gharapetian's method comprises (a) remote control 100 receiving a plurality of address codes (see Fig. 5 and Sections [0028]-[0031]); and (b) remote control 100 using the received address codes to cause commands to be mapped to select command keys such that activation of one or more of the select command keys causes remote control 100 to control an appliance that has been associated with each received address code (see Fig. 3 and Sections [0018], [0024]-[0026], and [0028]). Regarding claims 91-92, 102 and 105, Gharapetian teaches that remote control 100 has at least one input device 120 that is dedicated to simultaneously turning on or off electronic devices 102, 104, and 106 (see Sections [0017], [0019], and [0020]). In other words, Gharapetian's method comprises using the address codes of electronic devices 102, 104, and 106 to automatically map select commands to select command keys in a mode of remote control 100 such that a plurality of electronic devices 102, 104, and 106 are simultaneously commandable when remote control 100 is placed into the mode by a user pressing input device 120 that is dedicated to simultaneously turning on or off electronic devices 102, 104, and 106. Once the command sequence/macro is setup, it

Art Unit: 2612

is stored in memory (par. 0023 of Gharapetian) without again requiring the setup procedure. Obviously, the setup may include user input of the address or input of the address from a tag as suggested by col. 9 lines 16-25 teaching appliance ID input by user selection or signal from the appliance. Regarding claims 103-104 and 106-107, it is understood that the pressing of input device 120 that is dedicated to simultaneously turning on or off electronic devices 102, 104, and 106 places remote control 100 in a home theater mode (as called for in claims 103 and 106) or room mode (as called for in claims 104 and 107) since pressing input device 120 simultaneously turns on or off a home theater system comprising amplifier 102, TV 104, DVD player 106, control boxes for room lighting, control boxes for controlling a room's curtains, etc. (see Sections [0006]-[0009], [0017], and [0019]).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

12. Claims 72-81 are allowed.

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 68-71 and 82-107 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

14. Applicant's arguments filed 6-4-07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

15. The argument that claims 91-92 and 101-107 is supported because page 16 line 16+ describes "after" is no persuasive

Art Unit: 2612

because "without again requiring use by the device" appears to be contradicted by "using multiple steps" (pg 16 line 11), "second time" (pg. 16 line 19) and/or "additionally use" (pg 16 line 20) of setup process on at least pages 15-16.

### **Conclusion**

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Kitao (US006124804A) discloses remote control configured in response to device code from appliance that identifies the appliance (category, lot number, etc.) and manufacturer of the appliance.

### **CONTACT INFORMATION**


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edwin C. Holloway, III whose telephone number is (571) 272-3058. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9:00 to 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Zimmerman, can be reached on (571) 272-3059.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

EH  
8/13/07  
(571) 272-3058

  
EDWIN C. HOLLOWAY, III  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 2612